

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	TION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/642,586	642,586 08/19/2003		Nicolas I. Kacevas	02207/684502	2935	
23838	7590	07/20/2006		EXAM	INER	
KENYON & KENYON LLP 1500 K STREET N.W.				COLEMAN, ERIC		
SUITE 700				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005				2183		
				DATE MAILED: 07/20/2006	DATE MAILED: 07/20/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/642,586	KACEVAS, NICOLAS I.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Eric Coleman	2183	

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief --The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 23 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal, To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on ___ ___. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). **AMENDMENTS** 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below): (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below): (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: 15 and 16. Claim(s) rejected: 1-14 and 17-20. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11.

The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 13. Other: ____

ric Coleman **Primary Examiner** Continuation of 3. NOTE: The change in scope of the claims (e.g., addition of in parallel "to the instruction pipeline" and in parallel "to the plurality of instruction pipeline stages") would necessitate a new search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons stated in the final rejection. As to the proposed changes, the scope of the claims provide for store (and restore) of data into (and from) the memory in parallel without specification as to what it was in parallel to in the store or restore operation. The cited reference taught the system that operated to store and restore mispredicted results under the claimed conditions as detailed in the outstanding final rejection. The proposed change includes the store and restore was in parallel "to the instruction pipeline" and parallel "to the plurality of stages of the instruction pipeline". This clearly changes the scope of the claimed invention and also provides an ambiguity as to how the parallel operation is performed (i.e., if its in parallel to an instruction pipeline are there parallel connections to plural stages or parallel bits sent via one portion of the pipeline As to the arguments the reference taught differently treating the predicted path and msipredicted path, as the predicted path was executed regardless of conditions and the mispredicted path was executed only if enough resources were available. Also when prediction was resolved a tag field identified the stream that will continue processing and which will be canceled (e.g., see col. 10, lines 1-13 of Sharangpani). Therefore clearly when retrieving data in the predetermined misprecited path that was resolved was the correct path the pipeline retrieved data previsoulsy stored for use after resolution of the branch. This would have been done whether the data was in cache or registers or pipeline buffers provided in at least one implementation for a parallel storing and restoring of the results at least since the data would have been stored or restored as parallel bits to a register or cache or pipeline register.